REMARKS

Rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §101

  The examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants assert that claims 1-28 as originally filed recited statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101. Claim 1 as amended herein recites a change in the external data is autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model. The autonomic change in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model based on a change in external data is a useful, concrete and tangible result for claim 1 as amended. All the other independent claims, namely claims 8, 9, 15, 17, and 26 all recite autonomically changing the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model based on a change in external data, and therefore all recite the same useful, concrete and tangible result as claim 1. For the reasons given above, applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-5, 7-23 and 25-28 recite statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. §101.

Rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

  The examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for various problems with antecedent basis. The examiner states there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the logic in the framework mechanism" in line 10 of claim 1. Claim 1 recites "that defines logic that specifies . . ." at line 7 of claim 1. This logic is defined by the object oriented framework mechanism recited in line 4. As a result, "the logic in the framework mechanism" recited in line 10 of claim 1 has proper antecedent basis at line 7 of claim 1, and the examiner's rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error.

Claims 2-7 were rejected because of their dependency on claim 1. Because claim 1 has no problem with antecedent basis, the examiner's rejection of claims 2-5 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is in error.

The examiner rejected claim 6, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the hierarchy of information . . . model" in line 3. The limitations in former claim 6 have been added to claim 1. The hierarchy of information at line 12 of claim 1 as amended has antecedent basis at line 6 of claim 1, which recites "a hierarchy of information." The platform independent product configuration selection model at lines 12 and 13 of claim 1 as amended has antecedent basis at lines 5 and 6 of claim 1, which recites "a platform independent product configuration selection model." As a result, the examiner's rejection of claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error, because the claim limitations in question in claim 1 as amended have proper antecedent basis in claim 1 as shown above.

The examiner rejected claim 8, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the logic in the framework mechanism" in line 12 and "the hierarchy of information . . . model" in line 15. The logic in the framework mechanism in line 12 of claim 8 has antecedent basis at line 10 of claim 8, which recites "logic that specifies . . .". This logic is defined by the object oriented framework mechanism recited in line 6. As a result, "the logic in the framework mechanism" recited in line 12 of claim 8 has proper antecedent basis at line 10 of claim 8. The hierarchy of information at line 14 of claim 8 has proper antecedent basis at line 8 of claim 8, which recites "a hierarchy of information . . .". The platform independent product configuration selection model at lines 14 and 15 of claim 8 has proper antecedent basis at lines 7 and 8 of claim 8, which recites "a platform independent product configuration selection model". Because the limitations at issue in claim 8 have proper antecedent basis in claim 8, the examiner's rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error.

The examiner rejected claims 9 and 15, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the new product" in line 10. The new product in line 10 of claim 9 has proper antecedent basis at lines 8 and 9 of claim 9, which recites "a new product". The new product in line 11 of claim 15 has proper antecedent basis at lines 9 and 10 of claim 15, which recites "a new product." Because the new product in claims 9 and 15 has proper antecedent basis, the examiner's rejection of claims 9 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error.

Claims 10-14 and 16 were rejected because they depend from rejected claims 9 and 15. Because claims 9 and 15 have no problem with antecedent basis as shown above, the rejection of claims 10-14 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error.

The examiner rejected claim 17, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the logic in the framework mechanism" in line 7. Claim 17 recites "that defines logic that specifies . . ." at lines 4 and 5 of claim 17. This logic is defined by the object oriented framework mechanism recited in line 2. As a result, "the logic in the framework mechanism" recited in line 7 of claim 17 has proper antecedent basis at line 5 of claim 17. As a result, the examiner's rejection of claim 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error.

Claims 18-25 were rejected because they depend from rejected claim 17. Because claim 17 has no problem with antecedent basis as shown above, the rejection of claims 18-25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error.

The examiner rejected claim 24, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the hierarchy of information . . . model" in line 3. The limitations in former claim 24 have been added to claim 17. The hierarchy of information at lines 9 and 10 of claim 17 as amended has antecedent basis at line 3 of claim 17, which recites "a hierarchy of information." The platform independent product configuration selection

12

model at line 10 of claim 17 as amended has antecedent basis at lines 2 and 3 of claim 17, which recites "a platform independent product configuration selection model." As a result, the examiner's rejection of claim 24 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, is in error, because the claim limitations in question in claim 17 as amended have proper antecedent basis in claim 17 as shown above.

The examiner rejected claim 26, stating there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the product configuration selection data in the database" at line 6, "the logic in the framework mechanism" in line 7, "the data upon . . . operates" in line 8, and "the hierarchy of information . . . model" in line 10. Claim 26 has been amended herein to correct the first and third problems in claim 26 identified by the examiner. The examiner states there is insufficient antecedent basis for "the logic in the framework mechanism" in line 7 of claim 26. Claim 26 recites "that defines logic that specifies . . ." at lines 4 and 5 of claim 26. This logic is defined by the object oriented framework mechanism recited in line 2. As a result, "the logic in the framework mechanism" recited in line 7 of claim 26 has proper antecedent basis at line 5 of claim 26. The hierarchy of information at line 9 of claim 26 has antecedent basis at line 3 of claim 26, which recites "a hierarchy of information." The platform independent product configuration selection model at lines 9 and 10 of claim 26 has antecedent basis at lines 2 and 3 of claim 26, which recites "a platform independent product configuration selection model." As a result, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the examiner's rejection of claim 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Claims 27 and 28 were rejected because of their dependency on rejected claim 26. Because claim 26 as amended has proper antecedent basis, the examiner's rejection of claims 27 and 28 is in error.

Rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The examiner rejected claims 1-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoskins. Claims 1 and 17 have been amended herein to include the limitations in former claims 6 and 24, respectively, which have been cancelled herein. The limitations added to claims 1 and 17 recite: "wherein the logic operates on the external data, thereby causing a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model." Nowhere does Hoskins teach or suggest a data-driven framework mechanism as recited in claims 1 and 17 as amended that causes a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model. The language in Hoskins cited by the examiner in the rejection of claim 6 has no teaching of this limitation. As a result, the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and because claim 1 has been amended herein to include the limitations of former claim 6, the examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case of obviousness for claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Should the examiner decide to maintain the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on Hoskins, applicants respectfully request that the examiner provide a detailed mapping of the teachings of Hoskins that allegedly reads on the limitation "thereby causing a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model" as recited in claims 1 and 17 as amended. Because Hoskins does not teach or suggest that a change in the external data is autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the framework, claims 1 and 17 are allowable over Hoskins.

Independent claims 8 and 26 include the limitation ""thereby causing a change in the external data to be autonomically reflected in the hierarchy of information in the platform independent product configuration selection model", and are therefore allowable for the same reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 17. Independent claims 9

and 15 both include limitation (3), which recites "the framework mechanism autonomically adding the new product to the hierarchy of information based on the data related to the new product." Nowhere does Hoskins teach or suggest a framework mechanism that autonomically adds a new product to a hierarchy of information in the framework based on the data related to the new product as recited in claims 9 and 15. As a result, claims 9 and 15 are also allowable over Hoskins.

The dependent claims, namely claims 2-5, 7, 10-14, 16, 18-25 and 27-28 all depend on independent claims that are allowable for the reasons given above. As a result, all of claims 2-5, 7, 10-14, 16, 18-25 and 27-28 are allowable as depending on allowable independent claims.

<u>Conclusion</u>

In summary, none of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, teach, support, or suggest the unique combination of features in applicants' claims presently on file. Therefore, applicants respectfully assert that all of applicants' claims are allowable. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if this would in any way advance the prosecution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

MARTIN & ASSOCIATES, L.L.C.
P.O. Box 548
Carthage, MO 64836-0548   By   /derekpmartin/
(417) 358-4700   Derek P. Martin
                                                      Reg. No. 36,595